

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed September 7, 2005 for the above-captioned application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants submit herewith a petition to revive this application as unintentionally abandoned.

Applicants confirm the telephone species election of epoxy polymers and phosphorous quenchers.

The Examiner indicates that the lined out references (all European or PCT patents) were not considered because copies were not provided. Applicants attach copies of these references and consideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify a two quencher composition in which the first quencher is specifically identified as an epoxy functional polymer, and the second quencher is one of the other specified quenchers. This claim is substantially the same as original claim 31, and claims 31-34 have therefore been canceled. Corresponding amendments have been made to independent claim 25.

Claims 21, 22, and 30 have been amended in view of the rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, and these amendments are believed to overcome this rejection. In addition, amendments have been made to conform dependent claims to the language of amended claim 1.

Claims 35-38 have been added. Claims 35 and 36 are supported, *inter alia*, in the final three lines of ¶ 0043. Claims 37 and 38 repeat claims 18 and 19, dependent on claim 36.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-10, 18-25 29-31 and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) or 103(a) over US Patent No. 4,760,107 of Nelson. Based on the amendment to claim 1, Nelson '107 is only of relevance to the extent it refers to a combination of an epoxy polymer with a second quencher. The Examiner asserts that Nelson '107 discloses combinations of an epoxy polymer and mannitol in Examples 11 - 13. The Examiner further noted that claims 18 and 19 did not affirmatively require the presence of the recited type of epoxy polymer.

Applicants submit that claims 9 and 10 and added claims 35 to 38, which specifically define the second quencher as a phosphorus compound, claims 18 and 19 which have been amended in view of the Examiner's remarks are clearly not anticipated by the Nelson '107

Appln No.: 10/814,971  
Amendment Dated: April 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

reference. Furthermore, the examiner has offered no reasoning as to why a combination of an epoxy polymer and mannitol would suggest a combination of an epoxy polymer and a phosphorous compound.

Claims 1 and 25 also now include the limitation that the first quencher is an epoxy-functional styrene (meth)acrylic copolymer. The epoxides used in examples 11-13 of Nelson '107 are both bis-phenol A resins. Thus, the rejection of these claims over Nelson is also believed to be in error.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection based on the Nelson reference should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10, 18-27, 29 and 30 were also rejected as anticipated or obvious over various other references. The Examiner does not argue that any of these references disclose an epoxy polymer quencher as reflected in the fact that original claim 31 was not rejected. Accordingly, these rejections are believed to be fully addressed by the amendment to claims 1 and 25.

For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Marina T. Larson, Ph.D  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32038

(970) 262-1800